DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 299 302 TM 012 092

AUTHOR Gomez, Joseph J.
TITLE Evaluation of the Dade-Monroe Teacher Education Center.
INSTITUTION Dade County Public Schools, Miami, FL. Office of Educational Accountability.
PUB DATE Feb 88
NOTE 77p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Inservice Teacher Education; Professional Development; *Professional Training; *Program Evaluation; *Public School Teachers; Teacher Aides; Teacher Attitudes; Teacher Centers; *Teacher Education Programs; Teacher Improvement
IDENTIFIERS Dade County Public Schools FL; *Dade Monroe Teacher Education Center FL

ABSTRACT

The Dade-Monroe (Florida) Teacher Education Center (TEC) was evaluated. The TEC was founded in 1979 and serves the instructional personnel (teachers, teacher aides, and teacher assistants) in the public schools of Dade and Monroe counties. Program documents were reviewed and structured interviews were held with 7 TEC facilitators, 9 council members, and 12 individuals who had requested an inservice course for reasons of personal growth or professional development. The TEC also offers ancillary programs and courses. An extensive survey of 1,246 instructional personnel in the district and a limited survey of two directors of centers in other districts were also conducted. It was apparent that inservice courses were the major service offered, with 65.3% of instructional personnel having taken at least one course. Personnel generally expressed satisfaction with TEC instructors, who are carefully selected and regularly evaluated. The only ancillary service appearing to be underutilized was the professional library. There is a perception of budget constraints among staff and service recipients; however, the TEC has been very effective in meeting the district's needs. Surveys and interview forms are appended. (SLD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED299302

DADE COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOLS

EVALUATION OF THE DADE-MONROE TEACHER EDUCATION CENTER

February 1988

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Joseph Gonzalez

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

OFFICE OF EDUCATIONAL ACCOUNTABILITY

Dade County Public Schools
Office of Educational Accountability
1450 Northeast Second Avenue
Miami, Florida 33132

EVALUATION OF THE DADE-MONROE TEACHER EDUCATION CENTER

February 1988

Principal Evaluator/Author: Joseph J. Gomez, Ph.D.
Program Evaluation Department

THE SCHOOL BOARD OF DADE COUNTY,

Dr. Michael Krop, Chairma
Mr. G. Holmes Braddock, Vice-C
Dr. Rosa Castro-Feinberg
Mr. Paul L. Cejas
Ms. Janet R. McAliley
Mr. Robert Renick
Mr. William H. Turner

Dr. Joseph A. Fernandez
Superintendent of School

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	iii
INTRODUCTION	1
Dade-Monroe Teacher Education Center	1
Inservice Training Activities of the TEC	3
DESIGN OF THE EVALUATION	5
Evaluation Questions	5
Sources of Data	6
RESULTS OF THE EVALUATION	9
Inservice Courses Offered by the TEC	10
Ancillary Programs and Services of the TEC	12
Participation in TEC Inservice Activities	14
TEC Instructors and Facilitators	21
Requesting an Inservice Course from the TEC	23
Budget Priorities of the TEC	24
Quality and Impact of TEC Inservice Activities	27
CONCLUSIONS	32
BIBLIOGRAPHY	38
APPENDIX A: Interview of TEC Facilitator	39
APPENDIX B: Interview of TEC Council Member	46
APPENDIX C: Interview: Procedure for Requesting TEC Service	51
APPENDIX D: Teacher Education Center Evaluation Instructional Personnel Survey	54
APPENDIX E: Survey of Teacher Education Center (TEC) Directors	63

LIST OF TABLES

		Page
Table 1:	Sources of Data for the Evaluation Questions	8
Table 2:	Interviews Completed	10
Table 3:	Survey Return Rates	11
Table 4:	Participation in TEC Inservice Courses	15
Table 5:	Reasons for Not Participating in TEC Inservice Courses	16
Table 6:	Renewal/Enhancement of Teacher Certificates through the TEC	17
Table 7:	Participation in TEC Ancillary Programs and Services	18
Table 8:	Participation in Specific TEC Ancillary Programs and Services	19
Table 9:	Reasons for Not Participating in TEC Ancillary Programs and Services	20
Table 10:	Mean Ratings of Various Aspects of TEC Courses	29
Table 11:	Mean Ratings of the Management and Benefit of TEC Ancillary Programs and Services	31
Table 12:	Distribution of the "Grades" on the Overall Performance of the TEC	31

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Dade-Monroe Teacher Education Center (TEC) was founded in 1979 under the provisions of the Teacher Education Center Act. The TEC serves the instructional personnel in the public schools of Dade and Monroe counties. Teachers, teacher aides and teacher assistants can take inservice courses from the TEC for either personal growth or professional development. In addition, the TEC offers a number of ancillary programs and services like the Educational Travel Program and the Professional Library. Master plan points earned from taking TEC inservice courses or participating in certain TEC programs can be used by teachers to enhance or renew their state certification. Teacher aides and teacher assistants can obtain district certification in a similar manner.

The evaluation of the TEC was primarily conducted in the latter half of the 1986-87 school year. The evaluation drew data from a number of different sources. These sources included a review of the literature, an examination of program documents, and informal interviews with the TEC director. The evaluation also included a number of structured interviews and surveys. Three sets of structured interviews were conducted. The three instruments developed for these interviews appear in Appendices A, B and C. The target populations of these instruments were respectively the TEC facilitators, the TEC Council members, and individuals who had requested an inservice course from the TEC.

In reference to the surveys, the evaluation included two. The instruments developed for these two surveys appear in Appendices D and E. The target populations of the surveys were respectively the instructional personnel in the district, and the directors of other teacher education centers in the state. Regarding the first survey, the recipients were 10.0% of the instructional personnel in the district. This sample was randomly selected from personnel records. This sampling procedure in conjunction with the return rate of 75.6% allowed for the generalization of the survey results to the entire target population. The recipients of the second survey were directors of other teacher education centers in the state. The purpose of this survey was to obtain comparative data that could be used to obtain a better perspective of the TEC. The target population of the survey included the directors of centers which serve only instructional personnel (i.e., no administrators) in relatively larger districts. Only three centers met this selection criteria; they were the centers for the districts of Duval, Broward and Orange. Responses to the survey were received from the directors of the latter two centers.

The data obtained from these various sources was used to address the issues raised in the evaluation questions listed in the Design of the Evaluation. These issues involve several aspects of the TEC operation including: (a) the inservice courses, (b) the ancillary programs and services, (c) the degree of participation, (d) the instructors and facilitators, (e) the procedure for requesting an inservice course, (f) the budget priorities, and (g) the quality and impact of the inservice activities. The evaluation consequently yielded the following conclusions:

1. Although the TEC responds to a variety of requests, recommendations and directives in the selection of the inservice courses it will offer, the primary determinant in terms of volume is the Inservice Program Survey.

2. The degree of participation in TEC inservice courses is impressive; 65.3% of the instructional personnel in the district have taken one or more inservice courses from the TEC. However, the degree of participation is disproportionately lower for secondary instructional personnel than for elementary. The data suggests that this may be due to the difficulty in meeting the more specialized needs of secondary instructional personnel.

3. The selection of TEC instructors is accomplished through a collaborative effort between the TEC and the universities affiliated with the center.

4. In making the selection of TEC instructors, consideration is given to a number of factors including the instructor's credentials, experience, availability, recommendations and evaluations. The evaluations, which are provided by the course participants, are particularly important. The TEC uses them to systematically screen the pool of TEC instructors. This practice appears to be successful, since the instructional personnel expressed general satisfaction with the TEC instructors.

5. Since the TEC anticipated the state's directive requiring a minimum of 10 hours of instruction for an approved inservice course, the center had eliminated courses which did not comply with the directive prior to the initiation of this evaluation. Consequently, no current or residual impact of this directive was noted in either the inservice courses offered or the degree of participation.

6. There is a perception held by a number of TEC Council members and TEC facilitators that the center is not adequately funded. In addition, the data provided some indications that the budget of the TEC may be proportionally less than other centers in the state. However, this evidence was not deemed sufficient to accurately gauge the adequacy of the center's budget. To make such a determination would require a fiscal analysis which was beyond the scope of this evaluation.

7. The TEC operates a variety of ancillary programs and services. The most important of these are listed and briefly described in the Introduction. The degree of participation in ancillary programs/services is impressive; 54.7% of the instructional personnel in the district have utilized one or more of these programs/services. Perhaps, the only one which appears to be underutilized is the Professional Library.

8. The job of TEC facilitator is a crucial element in the operation of the TEC. The data collected generally supports sustaining the job in its present form. This particularly applies to retaining

teachers-on-special-assignment (TSAs) in the position. Only one aspect of the job may warrant adjustment. It was revealed that on the average the facilitators currently devote approximately 20.0% of their time on the job to clerical tasks. This is clearly an inefficient use of a TSA's time.

9. In keeping with state statutes, the TEC Council has input in establishing the budget priorities of the center. And while determining the funding of specific activities is the responsibility of the director, it has been the director's practice to also obtain input from the Council on this matter. The result has been notable cooperation between the two parties. Yet despite this cooperation, there is considerable discontent among the Council members stemming from adjustments that have been made to the budget subsequent to their review. It should be noted that since the Council under the law functions only in an advisory capacity, there is nothing improper in such adjustments. However, adjustments which are made without consulting the Council serve only to foster discontent among the members; and this discontent can potentially undermine the operation of the Council.

10. The procedure for requesting that the TEC offer a particular inservice course is generally regarded as very convenient. Most individuals making such requests experience no problems adhering to the procedure. Nevertheless, the procedure was found to be unnecessarily cumbersome when the request involved a recurring course.

11. The district's instructional personnel perceived the quality of both the inservice courses and the ancillary programs/services to be high. Furthermore, they generally felt that they put into practice the knowledge and skills acquired in TEC inservice courses.

In summary, the evaluation of the TEC identified some issues that warrant attention. These issues, however, are minor when compared to the extent of the TEC operation. In general, despite the perception of budget constraints, the TEC has been very effective in meeting the inservice needs of the district's instructional personnel. It is noteworthy that when the instructional personnel were asked to "grade" the overall performance of the TEC, 87.2% gave the center a grade of "B" or higher. Considering that these grades are provided by the recipients of the center's services, they attest to the center's success.

INTRODUCTION

The Teacher Education Center Act of 1973 (FS 231.600-231.610) was designed to encourage the establishment of teacher education centers throughout the state. This act broke with tradition by making provisions for teachers to "play a major role . . . in identifying needed changes [in the educational programs of the schools] and in designing, developing, implementing, and evaluating solutions to meet the identified needs" (FS 231.601). The basic intent of the act is reflected in the composition of the council, which serves in an advisory capacity to the center. In accordance with the provisions of the act, school teachers must "constitute a majority" of council members. As such, school teachers have a direct voice in establishing a center's policies, procedures and objectives; they are also authorized to make recommendations on the employment of staff and the center's budget (FS 231.606).

Funding for this state program is provided under a formula that earmarks at least $4.00 per full-time equivalent (FTE) student for the "salaries, benefits ... [and] other direct operating expenses" of a center (FS 236.081). In addition, the state provides a separate allocation which is used to hire university instructors to teach the inservice courses offered by a center. While this "allocation for university services" is also based on FTE, it is unique in that the allocation is not released by the state until the service agreements have been signed. This procedure consequently encourages the collaboration between the centers and the universities in the delivery of inservice training.

Dade-Monroe Teacher Education Center

In 1974 only 10 centers were founded under the provisions of the Teacher Education Center Act. By 1980, however, every school district in the state was participating in the program. Currently there are 47 centers in the state - 42 single district centers and 5 multi-district consortia.

The Dade-Monroe Teacher Education Center (TEC) falls into the latter category. It was founded in 1979 to serve public school teachers in both Dade and Monroe counties. The TEC, however, is actually an organizational unit within the Bureau of Human Resource Development of the Dade County Public Schools. The TEC facilities, including the administrative offices and a professional library, are located in the North Central Area Office. The center has a professional staff of nine, consisting of a director, seven facilitators and a media specialist. Currently the director and the facilitators are teachers-on-special-assignment (TSAs). The clerical staff consists of eight full-time and one part-time secretary. The 1986-87 budget of the TEC, including funds allocated for university services, was $ 1,281,980.00.

The TEC Council currently consists of 20 members, who are appointed for three year terms. As the law specifies, the majority of the members are school teachers - ten teachers and one teacher assistant from Dade County and one teacher from Monroe County. The remaining Council members consist of three administrators from Dade County and one from

Monroe County, two representatives from affiliated universities, and two representatives from the community. The Council meets monthly during the regular school year to review the operation of the TEC. In compliance with the law, the Council develops goals and objectives for the TEC, reviews the policies and procedures of the operation, and makes recommendations on both the staff and the budget of the center.

The inservice training activities offered by the TEC are generally drawn from the Master Plan for Inservice Education. This document, which is prepared by the Bureau of Human Resource Development, contains a description of all the inservice training activities (i.e., components) currently approved by the district. As such, it is the legal basis for either renewing or enhancing a teaching certificate through master plan points.

In selecting the specific inservice training activities it will offer, the TEC must respond to directives from the state, requests from district offices, and requests from individual schools. The majority of the activities offered, however, are determined by the Inservice Program Survey. This is a survey of all instructional personnel, which is conducted each spring. The survey essentially asks the district's teachers, teacher aides and teacher assistants to identify the "generic areas of study" they wish to pursue through the TEC next year. The generic areas are prioritized based on the survey responses, and they are subsequently converted to specific inservice components from the Master Plan for Inservice Education. These components are then announced in the TEC inservice calendar, which is distributed to all appropriate work locations. There are two versions of the calendar published bimonthly - one for teachers, and one for teacher aides and teacher assistants.

In addition to the inservice calendar, the TEC also publishes TEC Review. This is a monthly newsletter that is distributed to all instructional personnel in the district. TEC Review is also distributed to appropriate district offices, as well as a number of private and parochial schools which have requested it. The newsletter contains a variety of articles and regular columns focusing on the services, programs, and training activities offered by the TEC.

Both the TEC Review and the TEC inservice calendar are important parts of the communication network of the center. The key component of the network, however, is the service provided by the TEC representative (i.e., the TEC rep) at the school level. The TEC rep is a teacher who serves as a liaison between the TEC and the school's instructional staff. The duties of a TEC rep include providing the school's instructional staff with information, forms, and publications from the TEC. The TEC rep also serves to keep the TEC abreast of the current inservice needs of the school. Occasionally the TEC rep even participates in the development of a new inservice component. The TEC rep is trained for these duties at an annual conference held in the fall. During this day-long conference, the TEC rep is oriented to the operation of the TEC and provided with the latest information on teacher inservice training, including national trends and legislative updates.

Inservice Training Activities of the TEC

The primary function of the TEC is the training of instructional personnel. Teachers, teacher aides and teacher assistants can take TEC inservice courses for either personal growth or professional development. The TEC offers inservice courses in such subjects as classroom management, group counseling, and computer literacy. These courses are offered free of charge in a variety of locations throughout the district. The courses are generally taught by instructors from universities affiliated with the TEC.

In addition to offering inservice courses, the TEC operates a variety of ancillary programs and services. Some, like the Add-on Certification Program, function as a package of inservice courses. Others, like the Educational Travel Program, offer a distinct alternative to inservice courses. The operation of these programs/services makes a considerable demand on the time of the TEC staff. Consequently, the evaluation of the TEC examined a number of these programs/services, including:

1. Educational Travel Program. This program provides instructional personnel with the opportunity to earn master plan points through approved educational travel.

2. Mini-Grant Program. As the name implies, this program consists of a fund that is available to instructional personnel for the development of special projects or attendance at professional meetings.

3. Conference/Seminar Credit Program. This program provides instructional personnel with the opportunity to earn master plan points through participation in approved conference/seminar inservice activities.

4. TEC Registration Unit. The unit maintains the records of master plan points earned, and assists instructional personnel with matters concerning credit conversion, credit documentation, certification, etc.

5. Review for the Florida Teacher Certification Examination. This 36-hour inservice course was developed in cooperation with Florida International University to assist teachers in preparing for the Florida Teacher Certification Examination.

6. Add-on Certification Program. By making available certain inservice courses, this program provides teachers with the opportunity to obtain certification in additional areas.

7. Teacher Aides and Assistants Internal Certification Program. This program provides teacher aides and teacher assistants with the opportunity to enhance their income by obtaining internal certification from the district.

8. Prescriptive Inservice. The TEC offers generic competency inservice courses, which are made available to teachers who require remediation in specific teaching skills.

9. Professional Library. The library is a multi-functional facility which provides instructional personnel with both library media resources and graphic support services; most of these resources and services are available through the school mail.

While this is not an exhaustive list of the programs/services of the TEC, it does represent the major ancillary undertakings of the center.

DESIGN OF THE EVALUATION

The Dade-Monroe Teacher Education Center (TEC) serves the instructional personnel in the public schools of Dade and Monroe counties. The TEC offers teachers, teacher aides and teacher assistants a variety of inservice courses. The TEC also offers a number of ancillary programs and services. Teachers can use master plan points earned from participating in these inservice activities to enhance or renew their state certification. In a similar manner, teacher aides and teacher assistants can obtain district certification.

Evaluation Questions

The evaluation of the TEC examined the center's primary function of training the district's instructional personnel. The basic objective of this examination was to gauge the efficacy of the TEC in providing this service. To this end, the following questions were addressed by the evaluation:

1. How are the number and types of inservice courses offered by the TEC determined?

2. How many instructional personnel take and complete inservice courses?

3. How are TEC instructors selected and evaluated?

4. What effect do the evaluations by inservice participants have on the TEC operation?

5. What effect has the increase in the minimum number of hours per course had on inservice offerings and participation?

6. What is the ratio of the TEC budget, including university allocated funds, to the number of: (a) staff, (b) hours of service, and (c) inservice courses offered? How do these indices compare to other centers in the state?

7. What other programs are operated by the TEC? What proportions of staff time and budget dollars are devoted to these programs? How do these proportions compare to other centers in the state?

8. What is the job of a TEC facilitator? Do the duties of the job require a teacher-on-special-assignment?

9. How are the budget priorities of the TEC established? What procedure is used to determine which activities are funded?

10. How convenient is the current procedure for requestion that the TEC offer a particular inservice course?

11. What is the quality of the TEC inservice training? What is the impact of inservice training taken for professional development?

These 11 evaluation questions served to focus the evaluation of the TEC on specific issues. In order to address these issues, it was necessary to draw data from a number of different sources.

Sources of Data

The evaluation of the TEC began with a review of the current literature on staff development to identify recommended practices. In conjunction with the review, TEC documents and publications were examined to obtain information on the operation of the center. Finally, a series of informal interviews, which continued throughout the duration of the evaluation, were conducted with the director of the TEC. These various activities provided a general orientation to both the field of staff development and the operation of the TEC. This orientation in turn provided a basis for the development of the interview and survey instruments that were used in the evaluation.

The evaluation of the TEC included three sets of structured interviews. Each set of interviews required a separate instrument. The three target populations were the TEC facilitators, the TEC Council members and individuals who had requested an inservice course from the TEC. Regarding the first set of interviews, all seven TEC facilitators were interviewed in February of 1987. The interviews focused on such issues as the general operation of the TEC and the job of facilitator (evaluation question #8). The instrument used in the interviews appears in Appendix A. Regarding the second set of interviews, the TEC Council members were interviewed in February and March of 1987. In this case, only a sample of 10 was selected for interview. As noted in the Introduction, the 20 members of the Council basically fall into four categories: (a) teachers, (b) administrators, (c) representatives from affiliated universities, and (d) representatives from the community. The interview sample consisted of half of the members in each category with the selection giving preference to the members with the greatest seniority. The latter provision was necessary, because at the time of the interviews 12 of the 20 members were new to the Council. The observations of these new members would have been of limited value to the evaluation. The interviews of the Council members focused primarily on the general operation of the TEC. The instrument used in the interviews appears in Appendix B. The third and final set of interviews targeted the individuals who had contacted the TEC to request an inservice course. Twelve of these individuals were randomly selected from requests made to the TEC between January and April of 1987. Since the size of the target population was undetermined, the evaluation plan called for sequential sampling. In other words, the sample of 12 individuals could have been increased, if the results of their interviews had been too inconsistent to draw conclusions. The results of the interviews, however, revealed

that such an increase was unwarranted. The interviews of these 12 individuals focused primarily on the issue of requesting inservice courses from the TEC (evaluation question #10). The instrument used in the interviews appears in Appendix C.

The evaluation of the TEC also included two surveys - an extensive survey of the instructional personnel in the district, and a limited survey of directors of centers in other districts. The survey of instructional personnel was conducted in May of 1987. A random sample of 10.0% of the teachers, teacher aides and teacher assistants in the district were surveyed. To insure objectivity, the survey forms were coded so that the identity of the selected personnel could be kept confidential. Additionally, no "middle men" were used in either the distribution or collection of the survey instruments. The correspondence with the selected personnel was done directly and individually. The survey of the instructional personnel focused primarily on the issues of the utilization of the center (evaluation question #2), and the quality of the TEC inservice training (evaluation question #11). Since the instructional personnel are the primary recipients of the center's services, their observations and assessments were a key source of data for the evaluation. The instrument used in the survey of the instructional personnel appears in Appendix D. The survey of the directors of other teacher education centers in the state occurred in June of 1987. The purpose of this survey was to obtain comparative data that could be used to gain a better perspective of the TEC. The target population of the survey included the directors of centers which serve only instructional personnel (i.e., no administrators) in relatively large districts. The appropriate centers were selected using information published in An Evaluation of Teacher Education Centers, a report produced in 1983 for the Education Standards Commission by Evaluation Systems Design, Inc. Only three centers met the selection criteria; they were the centers for the districts of Broward, Duval and Orange. The survey of the directors of these centers focused primarily on the issue of the ratios of the budget to staff and services (evaluation question #6). The instrument used in the survey appears in Appendix E.

Finally, regarding both the interview and survey instruments, it should be noted that all the items in these instruments are derived from the 11 basic evaluation questions listed in the previous section. The number of the evaluation question from which an item is derived appears in parentheses next to it. Additionally, it should be noted that almost without exception each of the 11 evaluation questions is addressed in more than one instrument. While some of the instruments function as the primary source of data for individual questions, generally the scope of these evaluation questions require drawing data from several sources. The sources of data for each of the evaluation questions are displayed in a matrix on Table 1.

Table 1

Sources of Data for the Evaluation Questions

Evaluation Questions	Sources of Data							
	Review Literature	Examine Documents	Interview Director	Interview Facilitators	Interview Council Members	Interview Individuals Requesting Inservice Course	Survey Instructional Personnel	Survey Other Directors
1. Number and types of inservice courses		1	1	1			1	
2. Instructional personnel participation		2	2				2	2
3. Instructor selection and evaluation		3	3	3	3		3	
4. Effects of participants' evaluations			4	4	4		4	
5. Effects of increase in hours per course			5	5	5			
6. Budget ratio indices		6	6					6
7. Other programs		7	7	7	7		7	7
8. Job of facilitator		8	8	8	8			8
9. Budget priorities		9	9	9	9			
10. Requesting an inservice course		10	10	10		10		
11. Impact and quality of inservice training	11				11	11	11	

RESULTS OF THE EVALUATION

The evaluation of the Dade-Monroe Teacher Education Center (TEC) drew data from a number of different sources. As noted in the Design of the Evaluation, these sources included a review of the literature, an examination of program documents, and informal interviews with the TEC director. The evaluation also included a number of structured interviews and surveys.

Three sets of structured interviews were conducted. The three instruments developed for these interviews appear in Appendices A, B and C. The target population of the instruments were respectively the TEC facilitators, the TEC Council members, and individuals who had requested an inservice course from the TEC. The evaluation plan called for the interview of all the TEC facilitators. The latter two target populations, however, were sampled. The sampling procedures utilized are described in the Design of the Evaluation. As Table 2 illustrates, all scheduled interviews were completed with the exception of one TEC Council member, who was unavailable during this phase of data collection.

The evaluation included two surveys. The two instruments developed for these surveys appear in Appendices D and E. The target populations of the surveys were respectively the instructional personnel in the district, and the directors of other teacher education centers in the state. Regarding the first survey, the recipients were 10.0% of the instructional personnel in the district. The sample was randomly selected from personnel records. The sampling procedure allowed for the generalization of the survey results to the entire target population. As illustrated in Table 3, the return rate of the survey instruments for this sample was 75.6%. This rate was more than adequate considering that the responses to the items in the survey were highly consistent. The recipients of the second survey were directors of comparable teacher education centers. As noted in the Design of the Evaluation, only three other centers in the state were deemed comparable to the TEC; they were the centers for the districts of Broward, Duval and Orange. Responses to the survey were received from the directors of the centers in Broward and Orange, yielding a return rate of 66.6%. The return rate, however, is not a crucial issue in this survey, since there was no intention of generalizing the results to the target population. The purpose of this survey was to collect data from comparable centers in order to obtain a better perspective of the TEC.

The data obtained from these various sources were used to address the issues raised in the evaluation questions listed in the Design of the Evaluation. These issues involve several aspects of the TEC operation. They include: (a) the inservice courses, (b) the ancillary programs and services, (c) the degree of participation, (d) the instructors and facilitators, (e) the procedure for requesting an inservice course, (f) the budget priorities, and (g) the quality and impact of the inservice activities. Each of these issues warrants individual scrutiny.

Table 2

Interviews Completed

Target Population	Subjects		Interviews Completed	
	n	% of Population	n	%
Facilitators	7	100.0	7	100.0
Council Members	10	50.0	9	90.0
Individuals requesting an inservice course from TEC	12	- [a]	12	100.0

[a]The size of this target population was undetermined.

Inservice Courses Offered by the TEC

The primary function of the TEC is the training of instructional personnel. And despite the center's numerous ancillary programs and services, the principal means of providing this training is the traditional inservice course. Consequently, the selection of the number and types of inservice courses offered by the TEC is very important. According to the interview of the facilitators, making this selection requires the TEC to respond to requests from individual schools, recommendations from TEC reps, requests from district offices, and directives from the state. In addition, the TEC attempts to offer new courses that the facilitators may have "come into contact with ..., things the [instructional personnel] may not know to ask for." In terms of total volume, however, the facilitators generally agree that the primary determinant in the selection of the number and types of courses offered by the TEC is the Inservice Program Survey. This is a survey of all instructional personnel, which is conducted each spring.

The facilitators, nevertheless, expressed some reservations about the use of this survey. Some expressed a general concern that this method of assessing needs is too "course directed" and not sufficiently "proactive." In the words of one facilitator, "the focus is too much on the present, ... [and the TEC needs] to plan for the future." This reservation is mirrored in the current literature on staff development. Jones and Hayes (1980) have warned that "planners of staff development ... may wrongly assume that statements of needs made by teachers are their needs rather than symptoms of needs that must be diagnosed more completely." The facilitators were also concerned about specific aspects of the survey procedure. They offered several suggestions for improving the survey including: (a) conducting it earlier in the year when interest is greater, (b) having the survey instrument professionally developed, (c) sampling rather than surveying all instructional personnel, and (d) finding ways to increase the return rate. Several of these suggestions

Table 3

Survey Return Rates

Target Population	Subjects		Return Rates	
	n	% of Population	n	%
Instructional Personnel	1648	10.0	1246	75.6
Directors from Comparable Centers	3	100.0	2	66.6

Note: The percentages are truncated at the first decimal place.

were prompted by the consistently low return rate of the survey. The rate based on the entire target population has been approximately 30.0% to 35.0%.

The low return rate, however, may be a reflection of the target population's tacit approval of the inservices courses offered by the TEC. Certainly the survey of instructional personnel conducted for the evaluation disclosed no dissatisfaction regarding this matter. For example, the evaluation survey revealed that of the respondents who had never taken an inservice course from the TEC, only 3.9% indicated that the reason for this was that their "professional/career needs were not met by the inservice courses offered." Thus, despite the possible shortcomings of the Inservice Program Survey, it appears that the vast majority of the instructional personnel are satisfied with the inservice courses offered by the TEC.

Beyond the method of selection, there are a number of factors that can potentially influence the inservice courses offered by the TEC. For example, it is obvious that the budget of the center and the availability of instructors influence the courses offered. Another such factor, which was a focal point in the evaluation, was the state's directive requiring a minimum of 10 hours of instruction for an approved inservice course. This directive, which was issued in 1985, was prompted by the state's contention that courses consisting of less than 10 hours have little impact. The current literature on staff development supports this contention. Sparks (1983) noted that "most research ... has indicated that inservice programs consisting of a single session are largely ineffective." In order for teachers "to demonstrate new skills and strategies," it is not enough to just present them with theory. Teachers must be "provided opportunities for any combination of modeling, practice or feedback" (Joyce & Showers, 1980).

The specific focus of the evaluation was the impact of the 10 hour requirement on the inservice courses offered and the participation. Discussions with the TEC director revealed that the center had antici-

pated the state's directive and was in the process of eliminating courses which did not comply when the directive was issued. Therefore, the impact on the courses offered was for the most part a moot issue. Furthermore, in respect to participation, the director perceived no impact. Indeed, participation in inservice courses offered by the TEC has been steadily increasing.

The perception of the director was also held by the TEC Council members. Seven of the nine members interviewed indicated that the 10 hour requirement had had no discernible impact on the courses offered or the participation. The TEC facilitators concurred; six of the seven facilitators perceived no impact. Yet despite this general perception, some individuals interviewed expressed reservations about the 10 hour requirement. One Council member lamented that this requirement precluded vocational teachers from receiving master plan points from certain courses developed by industry. Two facilitators expressed concern about the hardship the 10 hour requirement would impose on instructional personnel.

The survey of instructional personnel, however, did not reflect this latter concern. For example, of the respondents who had never taken an inservice course from the TEC, only 3.9% indicated that the reason for this was that their "personal needs (e.g., convenience, accessibility) are not met by the inservice courses offered by the TEC." Furthermore, when the instructional personnel were asked to rate certain statements about their most recent inservice course using a four-point scale ranging from agree (4) to disagree (1), they gave a mean rating of 3.5 to the statement: "The time frame of the course (i.e., the number and length of sessions) facilitated learning." Indeed, the survey respondents expressed general satisfaction with all aspects of the delivery of their most recent inservice course. Not only did they find the time frame acceptable, but they felt that advance information on the course was "readily available," and the setting of the class was both "appropriate and comfortable." Statements regarding advance information and the class setting received mean ratings of 3.7 and 3.5 respectively. Consequently, neither the survey nor the interviews produced any evidence that the state's 10 hour minimum requirement on inservice courses had had much of an impact on the TEC course offerings or the degree of participation.

Ancillary Programs and Services of the TEC

As detailed in the Introduction, the TEC operates a variety of ancillary programs and services. These programs/services provide a number of alternatives to instructional personnel who seek inservice training. The evaluation of the TEC focused on the following nine programs/services:

1. Educational Travel Program
2. Mini-Grant Program
3. Conference/Seminar Credit Program
4. TEC Registration Unit
5. Review for the Florida Teacher Certification Examination
6. Add-on Certification Program
7. Teacher Aides and Assistants Internal Certification Program
8. Prescriptive Inservice
9. Professional Library

While this is not an exhaustive list of the programs/services of the TEC, it does represent the major ancillary undertakings of the center. Brief descriptions of these programs/services appear in the Introduction.

The specific focus of the evaluation was the demand made by ancillary programs/services on the resources of the TEC. The evaluation plan called for gauging this demand in part by the proportion of the center's budget devoted to them. However, it was subsequently determined that this criterion would not accurately reflect the demand on resources, since a number of these programs/services have no budget per se. The demand on resources made by them for the most part is restricted to a portion of the facilitators' services. Therefore, it was decided to gauge the demand by the proportion of the facilitators' time devoted to the ancillary programs/services.

The interview of the facilitators revealed that all of them devote a portion of their time on the job to ancillary programs/services. The proportion of this time ranges from negligible to a high of 40.0%, which was reported by the facilitator who coordinates the TEC Registration Unit. The proportion varies depending on the particular programs/services coordinated by the facilitator. The facilitators also noted that the proportion varies depending on the activities involved at different times in the school year, and on the popularity of a program/service in any given year. However, on an average the facilitators reported devoting approximately 20.0% of their time on the job to ancillary programs/services.

This appears to be a considerable portion of time to devote to ancillary activities. If summed across facilitators, it would mean that the equivalent of 1.4 of the 7 facilitators devote their time exclusively to these activities. Moreover this does not take into consideration the media specialist, who works exclusively for the Professional Library. Nevertheless, according to the TEC Council members, this time is well spent. Six of the nine Council members interviewed felt that "the impact of these [programs/ services] justifies the resources allocated to them." Some of the members, on the other hand, expressed concern about individual programs/ services. One program/service that consistently arose in the comments was the Professional Library, which makes heavy demands on the resources of the TEC. Opinions about the Professional Library ranged widely. One Council member observed that "the library has been a dream of the Council." Another member commented bluntly that the library "had absolutely no impact." Despite such differences in opinion, there was general agreement among the Council members that the library "is not used to the degree it should be." The survey of the instructional personnel confirmed this perception.. Only 10.0% of the respondents reported ever having used the Professional Library.

Despite this lack of use, most of the Council members are not ready to forsake the Professional Library or any other ancillary program/service. Seven of the nine Council members interviewed felt that the allocation of resources to these programs/services should either remain as is or be

increased. The feeling of most of the members was expressed in the comment that "by having more options you increase the likelihood of providing an appropriate delivery of service." This view is supported by the literature in the field. From their research, Zigarmi, Betz and Jensen (1977) have concluded that "there are many approaches to staff development" that merit consideration. And, the ideal scenario according to Hall and Loucks (1978) is "to individualize and personalize staff development" as much as possible.

Finally, in an effort to gain a better perspective of the proportion of time devoted to ancillary programs/services, the situation at the TEC was compared with other teacher education centers in the state. This effort, however, proved to be futile. The survey of the directors of comparable centers revealed that the center in Orange County offers no ancillary programs/services, and the center in Broward County devotes all of its resources to such programs/services. The latter situation results from the method of funding. In Broward County a portion of teacher education center funds is allocated directly to the schools to finance individual inservice training activities. As a result, the funds allocated to the center are devoted exclusively to programs/services that correspond to the ancillary programs/services of the TEC. Thus, it would appear that although the Broward and Orange centers are comparable to the TEC in some respects, they are operationally unique with regards to ancillary programs/services. The comparison, therefore, did not provide a better perspective of the TEC.

Participation in TEC Inservice Activities

Having examined both the inservice courses and the ancillary programs/services offered by the TEC, the next issue that warrants attention is the participation in these activities. The degree of participation was primarily gauged by means of the survey of instructional personnel. In reference to inservice courses, the survey revealed that 65.3% of the respondents had taken one or more inservice courses from the TEC. Table 4 illustrates the degree of participation of the respondents categorized respectively by job and by school level. An examination of the data by job reveals that the teachers exhibit the highest degree of participation with 69.1%. The lowest degree of participation is exhibited by the teacher aides and teacher assistants with 24.7%. This low percentage, however, is attributable to the fact that TEC inservice courses have only recently been made available to teacher aides and teacher assistants. An examination of the data by the school level of the respondents reveals that the highest participation is not exhibited by one of the designated school levels. The highest degree of participation with 73.3% is exhibited by the "other" category, which includes, for example, teachers-on-special-assignment (TSAs) assigned to district offices. In addition, it should be noted that the regular day-school levels (i.e., elementary, junior high, and senior high) exhibit an inverse correlation between the level and the participation. In other words, participation drops as the school level rises.

Beyond the degree of participation, the evaluation also addressed the reasons for non-participation in inservice courses. The survey of instructional personnel revealed that 34.7% of the respondents had never

Table 4

Participation in TEC Inservice Courses

	Instructional Personnel	n	Participation Yes	Participation No
By Job:	Teacher	1010	698 (69.1)	312 (30.8)
	Teacher Aide/Assistant	93	23 (24.7)	70 (75.2)
	Other[a]	141	91 (64.5)	50 (35.4)
By School Level:	Elementary	680	479 (70.4)	201 (29.5)
	Junior High	224	133 (59.3)	91 (40.6)
	Senior High	236	127 (53.8)	109 (46.1)
	Community/Adult	42	28 (66.6)	14 (33.3)
	Other[b]	60	44 (73.3)	16 (26.6)

Note: The numbers in parentheses represent the percentages by row. The percentages are truncated at the first decimal place.

[a]This category includes teachers-on-special-assignment (TSAs), counselors, media specialists, etc.

[b]This category includes, for example, TSAs assigned to district offices.

taken an inservice course from the TEC. Inquiry into the reasons for their lack of participation produced the data on Table 5. Table 5, like Table 4, categorizes the respondents respectively by job and by school level. An examination of the data by job reveals that, not surprisingly, the most common reason given by the teacher aides and teacher assistants was lack of familiarity with the TEC. A total of 49.9% of them indicated that they were either "unfamiliar with the TEC" (reason #1) or "unfamiliar with the courses offered" (reason #2). This reflects the previously mentioned fact that TEC inservice courses have only recently been made available to teacher aides and teacher assistants. The most common reason given by the respondents in the remaining job categories was that "to date, [they had had] no reason to take a course" (reason #5). This was also the most common reason across school levels. It is interesting to note that this reason implies that the respondents have not ruled out the possibility of taking a course from the TEC in the future. The second most common reason across both jobs and school levels was reason #1, "unfamiliar with the TEC." Lack of familiarity with the TEC was generally reported by instructional personnel who are relatively new to the district. For example, cross tabulations of the survey items revealed that of the respondents with three years or less in the district who have never taken a course from the TEC, 41.7% indicated that the reason was that they were either "unfamiliar with the TEC" (reason #1) or "unfamiliar with the courses offered" (reason #2).

Table 5

Reasons for Not Participating in TEC Inservice Courses

Instructional Personnel:	By Job			By School Level				
Reasons	Teacher	Teacher Aide/ Assistant	Other[a]	Elementary	Junior High	Senior High	Community/Adult	Other[b]
1. Unfamiliar with the TEC	46 (15.3)	30 (45.4)	13 (26.0)	50 (25.9)	19 (21.8)	13 (12.3)	4 (30.7)	2 (12.5)
2. Unfamiliar with courses offered	7 (2.3)	3 (4.5)	4 (8.0)	6 (3.1)	4 (4.6)	1 (0.9)	1 (7.6)	2 (12.5)
3. Professional needs not met by courses	40 (13.3)	6 (9.0)	3 (6.0)	23 (11.9)	8 (9.2)	17 (16.1)	0 (0)	1 (6.2)
4. Personal needs not met by courses	39 (13.0)	3 (4.5)	7 (14.0)	16 (8.2)	14 (16.0)	17 (16.1)	1 (7.6)	1 (6.2)
5. To date, no reason to take a course	131 (43.8)	13 (19.7)	19 (38.0)	74 (38.3)	25 (28.7)	51 (48.5)	6 (46.1)	7 (43.7)
6. Other[c]	36 (12.0)	11 (16.6)	4 (8.0)	24 (12.4)	17 (19.5)	6 (5.7)	1 (7.6)	3 (18.7)
n	299	66	50	193	87	105	13	16

Note: Each respondent provided a single reason. The numbers in parentheses represent the percentages by column. The percentages are truncated at the first decimal place.

[a]This category includes teachers-on-special-assignment (TSAs), counselors, media specialists, etc.

[b]This category includes, for example, TSAs assigned to district offices.

[c]This category represents miscellaneous reasons provided by the respondents.

Table 6

Renewal/Enhancement of Teacher Certificates through the TEC

Teachers by School Level	n	Participation	
		Yes	No
Elementary	455	241 (52.9)	214 (47.0)
Junior High	126	40 (31.7)	86 (68.2)
Senior High	120	48 (40.0)	72 (60.0)
Community/Adult	29	12 (41.3)	17 (58.6)
Other[a]	42	20 (47.6)	22 (52.3)

Note: The numbers in parentheses represent the percentages by row. The percentages are truncated at the first decimal place.

[a]This category includes, for example, teachers-on-special-assignment assigned to district offices.

The survey also provided several other revelations about the inservice courses taken by instructional personnel. In terms of time, the survey revealed that the respondents had taken their last inservice course from the TEC relatively recently. A total of 56.1% of them indicated that at the time of the survey in May of 1987, they were either in the process of taking a course or had taken it "less than a year ago." In terms of motivation, the respondents were overwhelmingly motivated by professional considerations. "Professional growth" was reported by 91.1% of the respondents as the "primary reason for taking [their] most recent inservice course." "Personal growth" was reported by only 8.9% of the respondents. This outcome is in keeping with the literature in the field. Guskey (1986) noted that, while teachers may have other reasons for participating in staff development, most participate because "they want to become better teachers." In conjunction with professional growth, the teachers were questioned about renewing or adding a teaching area to their certificate through TEC courses. Of the teachers who had taken inservice courses from the TEC, 46.7% indicated they had applied these courses toward certification. Table 6 illustrates the proportion of teachers by school level who have utilized the TEC for either renewing or enhancing their certification. An examination of the table reveals that the highest proportion is exhibited by elementary teachers with 52.9%. In contrast, the lowest proportion is exhibited by the junior high teachers with 31.7%.

In addition to the participation in inservice courses, the TEC evaluation also examined the participation in the center's ancillary programs and services. The survey of instructional personnel revealed that 54.7% of the respondents had utilized one or more of the ancillary programs/services of the TEC. Table 7 illustrates the degree of participation of the respondents categorized respectively by job and by school level. An examination of the table reveals that the degree of participation in

Table 7

Participation in TEC Ancillary Programs and Services

Instructional Personnel		n	Participation Yes	Participation No
By Job:	Teacher	1007	575 (57.1)	432 (42.9)
	Teacher Aide/Assistant	92	22 (23.9)	70 (76.0)
	Other[a]	140	81 (57.8)	59 (42.1)
By School Level:	Elementary	679	386 (56.8)	293 (43.1)
	Junior High	223	114 (51.1)	109 (48.8)
	Senior High	234	106 (45.3)	128 (54.7)
	Community/Adult	41	28 (68.2)	13 (31.7)
	Other[b]	60	43 (71.6)	17 (28.3)

Note: The numbers in parentheses represent the percentages by row. The percentages are truncated at the first decimal place.

[a]This category includes teachers-on-special-assignment (TSAs), counselors, media specialists, etc.

[b]This category includes, for example, TSAs assigned to district offices.

these programs/services is very similar to the degree of participation in inservice courses. A comparison of the data in Table 7 with the data in Table 4 shows that with one exception, the categories exhibiting the highest and lowest degree of participation by job and by school level are the same.

Likewise, Table 7 exhibits the inverse correlation between participation and the regular day-school levels. As with Table 4, participation drops as the school level rises. Finally, Table 7 also exhibits a comparatively low degree of participation by teacher aides and teacher assistants. Only 23.9% of these individuals report having utilized the ancillary programs/services of the TEC. Like the situation with inservice courses, this low percentage is attributable to the fact that only recently have efforts been made to interest teacher aides and assistants in such programs/services.

The teacher aides and teacher assistants, however, have clearly shown an interest. This is apparent by the participation in the Teacher Aides and Assistants Internal Certification Program, which is the only major ancillary program/service developed expressly for teacher aides and teacher assistants. As Table 8 illustrates, the proportion of participation in this program is 21.5%, which is second only to the proportion of participation in the Conference/Seminar Credit Program. The data in Table 8 is based on the survey of instructional personnel; and it should be noted that each proportion of participation is computed based on the number of survey respondents eligible for the program/service.

Table 8

Participation in Specific TEC Ancillary Programs and Services

Programs/Services	Participants	Participation n	Participation %
Educational Travel Program	IP	64	5.1
Mini-Grant Program	IP	33	2.6
Conference/Seminar Credit Program	IP	303	24.3
TEC Registration Unit	IP	128	10.2
Review for the Florida Teacher Certification Examination	T	86	7.4
Add-on Certification Program	T	234	20.2
Teacher Aides and Assistants Internal Certification Program	A	20	21.5
Prescriptive Inservice	T	100	8.6
Professional Library	IP	125	10.1

Note: Percentages are computed based on the number of survey respondents in the appropriate category of Eligible Participants: IP = instructional personnel, 1246 respondents; T = teachers, 1153 respondents; A = teacher aides/assistants, 93 respondents. The percentages are truncated at the first decimal place.

The survey of instructional personnel also addressed the reasons for non-participation in ancillary programs/services of the TEC. The survey revealed that 45.3% of the respondents had never utilized any of these programs/services. Inquiry into the reasons for their lack of participation produced the data in Table 9. Table 9, like Table 7, categorizes the respondents respectively by job and by school level. An examination of the data reveals that the most common reasons for not utilizing the ancillary programs/services are very similar to the reasons for not taking inservice courses. Teacher aides and teacher assistants indicated they were "unfamiliar with the TEC" (reason #1), and the respondents in the remaining job categories indicated that "to date [they had had] no reason to utilize a program/service" (reason #5). The latter was also the most common reason reported across school levels. Consequently, the reasons for non-participation, as well as the degree of participation, in ancillary programs/services are very similar to those associated with inservice courses.

In summary, the data reveals that there is considerable participation in TEC inservice activities. Almost two-thirds of the instructional personnel in the district have taken one or more inservice courses from the TEC. More than half of the instructional personnel have utilized one or more of the ancillary programs/services. Moreover, of the individuals who have not participated in these inservice activities, approximately two-fifths have not ruled out the possibility of participating in the future. On the other hand, there are indications that the inservice

Table 9

Reasons for Not Participating in TEC Ancillary Programs and Services

Instructional Personnel:	By Job			By School Level				
Reasons	Teacher	Teacher Aide/ Assistant	Other[a]	Elementary	Junior High	Senior High	Community/Adult	Other[b]
1. Unfamiliar with the TEC	46 (12.5)	26 (42.6)	9 (16.3)	49 (19.3)	16 (17.3)	13 (11.7)	2 (14.2)	0 (0)
2. Unfamiliar with programs/ services offered	34 (9.2)	6 (9.8)	7 (12.7)	22 (8.7)	13 (14.1)	8 (7.2)	2 (14.2)	2 (15.3)
3. Professional needs not met by programs/services	39 (10.6)	6 (9.8)	4 (7.2)	24 (9.4)	9 (9.7)	14 (12.6)	1 (7.1)	1 (7.6)
4. Personal needs not met by programs/services	47 (12.7)	4 (6.5)	7 (12.7)	24 (9.4)	14 (15.2)	18 (16.2)	1 (7.1)	1 (7.6)
5. To date, no reason to utilize a program/service	167 (45.3)	11 (18.0)	24 (43.6)	105 (41.5)	30 (32.6)	53 (47.7)	7 (50.0)	7 (53.8)
6. Other[c]	35 (9.5)	8 (13.1)	4 (7.2)	29 (11.4)	10 (10.8)	5 (4.5)	1 (7.1)	2 (15.3)
n	368	61	55	253	92	111	14	13

Note: Each respondent provided a single reason. The numbers in parentheses represent the percentages by column. The percentages are truncated at the first decimal place.

[a]This category includes teachers-on-special-assignment (TSAs), counselors, media specialists, etc.

[b]This category includes, for example, TSAs assigned to district offices.

[c]This category represents miscellaneous reasons provided by the respondents.

activities of the TEC do not uniformly meet the needs of all types of instructional personnel. For example, the proportion of participation in inservice activities declines from the elementary level to the junior high level, and again from the junior high level to the senior high level. The data suggests that this decline in participation may be due to the difficulty in meeting the more specialized needs of instructional personnel at the secondary level. While this may be cause for concern, it should be acknowledged that this situation does not appear to be unique to the TEC. The 1983 study of the teacher education centers in the state conducted by Evaluation Systems Design, Inc., found that a comparatively lower rate of participation by teachers in "specialized areas" was a common phenomenon across centers.

TEC Instructors and Facilitators

The TEC employs a professional staff of nine consisting of a director, seven facilitators, and one media specialist. Supporting the professional staff, there is a clerical staff consisting of nine secretaries - eight full-time and one part-time. In addition, the TEC employs, as needed, numerous instructors to deliver the inservice courses offered by the center. These instructors are, for the most part, on the staff of universities affiliated with the TEC. The issues addressed by the evaluation of the TEC involved two of the above jobs, the instructor and the facilitator.

As the provider of the inservice training, the instructor is obviously a key element in the TEC operation. As such, the evaluation of the TEC focused on the selection, evaluation and quality of the instructors. Regarding the selection of instructors, all the facilitators generally agreed that it was accomplished through a "collaborative effort" between the TEC and the affiliated universities. In making the selection, consideration is given to a number of factors including the instructor's credentials, experience, availability, recommendations, and evaluations.

The instructor's evaluations, according to the facilitators, are an important factor in the selection process. The evaluations are provided by the participants in the inservice course. The evaluation instrument is a ten-item questionnaire, which addresses such issues as: (a) the attainment of the course objectives, (b) the relevance of the materials, and (c) the quality of the course content. The results of the evaluations are tabulated at the conclusion of each course, and they are subsequently forwarded to the instructor. Copies of the results are also kept on file at the TEC for future reference. According to the director of the TEC, if an instructor exhibits "a pattern of low evaluations," the situation is investigated. This usually involves having a facilitator monitor the course. If it is determined that the instructor is indeed deficient, the TEC then takes steps to avoid employing the individual in the future. In contrast, the TEC director noted that an instructor with a pattern of high evaluations is "used repeatedly by [the center] - that is the nature of the process."

The success of this process can ultimately be gauged by the quality of the instructors selected. The TEC Council members who were interviewed generally felt that the instructors were very good. More importantly, the instructors received high marks from the instructional personnel surveyed. The instructional personnel were asked to rate the following statement about their most recent TEC instructor on a four-point scale ranging from agree (4) to disagree (1): "The instructor of the course was both knowledgeable and effective." The mean rating was 3.7, with 78.7% of the respondents rating the statement a 4. Thus, the participants in the inservice courses of the TEC are clearly satisfied with the instructors selected.

While it may be obvious that the instructor is a key element in the TEC operation, the same cannot be said about the facilitator. The importance of this job to the operation of the TEC is not readily perceived outside the center. As a result, questions are occasionally raised about the nature of the job. Consequently, the evaluation of the TEC focused on several aspects of the job of facilitator including: (a) the duties of the job, (b) the possibility of revising the job under some other organizational system, and (c) the need for TSAs as facilitators.

For the most part, the facilitators found it difficult to describe the duties of a "typical facilitator." One said simply that a facilitator "facilitates teacher training." Several others used the word "coordinator" to describe the job. The utilization of such circular definitions and vague terms may be prompted by the considerable diversity of the job. An examination of the duties of the facilitators revealed that on a typical day they perform a variety of tasks that range from clerical to administrative. These tasks included for example: making a presentation to area directors, writing a status report on an ancillary program, checking the logistics of a series of courses, revising a program form, processing program forms, completing the billing on a conference, conducting a meeting with school-level personnel, trouble-shooting a course conflict, closing out a course, etc. The diversity of the job was perhaps best described by a TEC Council member who observed that a facilitator "wears many hats, ... [the job] ranges from clerical to program design."

The diversity of the job, coupled with the fact that facilitators are generally only observed outside the center when they open or close out a course, may have contributed to the speculation about the nature of the job. However, the TEC Council members, who are in a unique position to observe the operation of the center, generally agree that the job of facilitator is "one of the most important arms of the TEC." Furthermore, the Council members interviewed generally agree that the facilitators "do an excellent job... [and] they work long hours." Regarding this latter observation, the interview of the facilitators revealed that the typical facilitator works an excess of 40 hours per week, and at least occasionally works nights and weekends.

Yet it has been noted that some of the tasks contributing to this formidable workload are clerical. One TEC Council member, who was particularly concerned about the role of facilitator observed:

> Originally, the TEC facilitators were supposed to be part-time instructors. They're now doing a lot of paperwork that could be done by secretaries. I feel they should be utilized more on the instructional end of the job.

Concern about this issue was also expressed by the facilitators themselves. Their interview revealed that all of them routinely did tasks they felt could be readily done by a secretary. When asked about the proportion of their workload they considered to be clerical, the responses ranged from a low of 10.0% to a high of 40.0%. The computation of the mean revealed that the typical facilitator devotes approximately 20.0% of the time on the job to clerical tasks.

The issue of facilitators performing clerical tasks was also raised when both the Council members and the facilitators were asked to speculate on whether "the duties of the TEC facilitator [could] be more efficiently performed under some other organizational system." The only common response by both the Council members and facilitators was to suggest an increase in the clerical staff of the TEC. For the most part, both the Council members and facilitators expressed confidence in the existing system. They were particularly adamant about retaining the TSAs in the position of facilitators. Without exception every facilitator and Council member interviewed stated that a background in teaching was necessary to perform the job of facilitator. In the words of one Council member, a teaching background gives the facilitator "a feel for teachers...; without the background, it would be difficult for them to perform the job." A second Council member added that "it should be a requirement of the job..., [since] you need that frame of reference." In brief, the evidence indicates that while some adjustment in the duties of the facilitators may be in order, a major revision of the job is not warranted.

Requesting an Inservice Course from the TEC

While the Inservice Program Survey is numerically the primary determinant in the selection of courses offered by the TEC, it is not the only determinant. As previously mentioned, the TEC also responds to, among other things, requests from individual schools and district offices. The evaluation of the TEC focused on the procedure for making such requests.

According to the director of the TEC, the procedure for requesting an inservice course simply involves submitting the appropriate form to the center. To provide a sufficient lead time, the TEC requests that this form be submitted at least 30 days prior to the first session of the course. Nevertheless, the director added that the center did not always adhere to this procedure, since it attempted to accommodate individual situations. The interview of 12 individuals, who had submitted requests for inservice courses to the TEC between January and April of 1987, revealed this to be the case. When asked about their initial step in requesting a course, seven mentioned submitting the form. Five, however, indicated that their initial step was to call the TEC. Furthermore, when asked about the lead time of their most recent request, seven

admitted that it had been submitted less than 30 days prior to the first session of the course. Not surprisingly, almost all these individuals found, in the words of one, that "the TEC was nice enough, even though [the request] was late."

One of the individuals interviewed, on the other hand, was of the opinion that it was inappropriate to require the 30-day lead time for "recurring courses." This individual commented:

> We've had conflicts [with the TEC over] recurring courses. [When] we take care of everything, there shouldn't be a 30-day lag. There should be two procedures. The 30-day lag is needed only if the TEC sets up the course.

The interview of the facilitators indicated that to a degree they concur. While four of the seven were satisfied with the existing procedure, three felt that it should be "streamlined." One facilitator mentioned specifically the above situation:

> We have the same procedure for handling every [request]. It should be streamlined ... for courses that have been done repeatedly.

The possible need for streamlining notwithstanding, the 12 individuals interviewed expressed general approval of the existing procedure. Most had experienced no problems in adhering to the procedure. And, when asked to judge its convenience, 11 of the 12 indicated that they found the procedure to be "very convenient."

Budget Priorities of the TEC

Funding for the teacher education centers in the state is provided under a formula that earmarks at least $4.00 per full-time equivalent (FTE) student for the operating expenses of a center. In addition, the state provides a separate allocation which is used to hire university instructors to teach the inservice courses offered by a center. This allocation for "university services" is also based on FTE, however, it is unique in that the allocation is not released by the state until a service agreement has been signed between a center and a university. Any additional funds which are required by a center must be provided by the local district.

The TEC receives only $3.00 of the $4.00 allocated by the state. The fourth dollar is incorporated into the budget of the Beginning Teacher Program; which, although organizationally distinct from the TEC, provides inservice training to teachers. In the 1985-86 school year, this source of funds yielded $729,834.00 for the operating expenses of the TEC. In addition, the state provided $409,320.00 for university services. The budget was not enhanced locally, so the total budget of the TEC in the 1985-86 school year was $1,139,154.00. The 1985-86 budget is being used as an example, because 1985-86 was the last complete fiscal year at the time comparative data was collected in the spring of 1987.

The evaluation of the TEC examined the process of establishing the budget priorities of the center. Since State Statute 231.606 specifies that the "duties and responsibilities" of the TEC Council include making "recommendations on an appropriate budget," the interview of the Council members addressed this process. It revealed that, in keeping with the intent of the law, eight of the nine members interviewed felt they had at least some input in establishing budget priorities. Furthermore, when asked about the procedure used to determine which activities are funded under a priority item, most Council members generally felt that, in the words of one member:

> This is the responsibility of the director ... but [the director] runs it past the Council ... [,and] most of the time we see eye-to-eye.

Yet, despite the apparent cooperation between the TEC director and the Council in establishing the budget priorities of the center, there is considerable discontent among the Council members regarding the budget.

The interview of the Council members revealed that the discontent stems in part from the perception that the TEC is underfunded. Although the Council members were not specifically queried about this issue, questions concerning the budget prompted remarks like the following:

> The TEC is expected to increase service, like providing inservice courses to teacher aides and assistants, with the same budget.
>
> If the TEC has a responsibility, it should be funded. Professionalization places a burden on the TEC, but it isn't being funded.
>
> The other departments in the bureau receive enhancements. The TEC doesn't, but our costs keep increasing.

The Council members' discontent with the budget also stems from adjustments that are made to it subsequent to their review. As with the previous issue, the Council members were not specifically queried about such adjustments; however, a number of comments regarding this issue were advanced by them including the following:

> We're presented with the budget for [review], but by the time it is cast in stone many changes have occurred; and we don't know the sources of them.
>
> This year $18,500 was taken for [another program], but they never consulted the Council ... we had to eat it.
>
> The salaries ..., materials, etc. are discussed with [the director], but [budget items] change very strangely over the year.

It must be emphasized that there is nothing improper in such budget adjustments. Under the law, the TEC Council can only make recommendations. As such, the Council's recommendations can be either accepted or rejected. Therefore, the immediate concern is not that such budget adjustments occur, or even whether the TEC is underfunded. While these two issues may warrant attention, the immediate concern is the discontent fostered by the situation, and the potential of this discontent to undermine the operation of the Council.

The degree of discontent associated with these budget issues was revealed by the Council members as well as the facilitators in their respective interviews. When the facilitators were asked to make suggestions for improving the present system for establishing budget priorities, the most common suggestion, which was offered by five of the seven facilitators, was to enhance the budget. The facilitators were particularly concerned with sufficient funds for hiring substitutes in order to release teachers to participate in inservice activities. One facilitator offered the following specific suggestions and rationale for enhancing the budget:

> You should hold [the staff's] salaries harmless. We don't get this benefit that the schools do. Also I think there should be a separate allocation for the Professional Library ... [since] the library serves the entire district. Basically there needs to be a realistic expectation of what the TEC should do, and then provide sufficient funding.

The suggestion most often made by the Council members also concerned the provision of "sufficient funding"; four of the nine members interviewed mentioned this. In addition, four of the nine members interviewed suggested that the Council, in the words of one, "be informed when funds are removed from the budget."

Such comments about the budget, in conjunction with the evaluation's attempt to gauge the efficacy of the TEC, prompted a review of the center's budget. As previously mentioned, in the 1985-86 school year the total budget of the TEC, including funds for university services, consisted of $1,139,154.00. With this budget the center underwrote such major items as the salaries of the staff, the ancillary programs/services, and the inservice training activities. Regarding the latter, there were 711 separate inservice training activities underwritten, which generated 246,370 service hours for 15,379 participants. In an effort to ascertain how this compared to other centers, the evaluation included a survey of the directors of comparable teacher education centers in the state.

As described in the Design of the Evaluation, only three centers met the selection criteria of serving only instructional personnel in a relatively large district. The three were the centers for the districts of Broward, Duval and Orange. The survey of the directors, however, was unproductive for a variety of reasons. Broward County, as previously discussed, allocates a portion of teacher education center funds

directly to the schools to finance individual inservice training activities. This arrangement was deemed too distinct from the centralized operation of the TEC to allow for a meaningful comparison. Also a comparison with the center in Orange County was precluded by its current practice of providing inservice training for administrators. And, there was no response received from the center in Duval County.

Consequently, it was not possible to produce a meaningful comparison of budget, staff, courses offered, etc. between the TEC and the centers which were deemed comparable. However, the effort was not entirely fruitless. As previously stated, the intent of the effort was simply to gain a better perspective of the TEC, and in this respect some interesting observations were made. For example, although a district is free to enhance the budget of its center, neither of the responding centers received enhancements in the 1985-86 school year. The TEC apparently is not unique in this respect. However, this does not mean that the centers were operating on proportionally the same budget. Broward County, for example, allocates $2.30 per FTE to its center, which compares favorably with the $3.00 per FTE allocated to the TEC. However, Broward County also allocates $2.00 per FTE directly to the schools for inservice training activities, which brings the total amount allocated for this purpose up to $4.30. Viewed from this perspective, the TEC does not compare favorably.

Quality and Impact of TEC Inservice Activities

The final issue that was examined by the evaluation of the TEC was the perceived quality and impact of the TEC inservice activities. In reference to the latter, the TEC Council members were asked about the "general impact on job performance of TEC inservice training taken for professional development." Seven of the nine Council members felt that such training had at least some impact on job performance. The Council members not only commented on their observations of instructional personnel but also on their own experiences in taking inservice courses; one remarked:

> When you take an inservice course, it does change you. It moves you out of the groove. It makes you stop and question and reexamine. It's a healthy experience.

The survey of instructional personnel revealed that they concur with the Council members. The instructional personnel were asked to rate the following statement about their most recent inservice course using a four-point scale ranging from agree (4) to disagree (1): "I have put into practice some of the knowledge/skills acquired in the course." The mean rating was 3.5, with 69.7% of the respondents rating the statement a 4.

Nevertheless, it should be acknowledged that this does not represent conclusive evidence that TEC inservice training has an impact on the participants' job performance. The experimental design and controls required to draw such a conclusion were beyond the scope of this evaluation. In surveying the instructional personnel, it should be under-

stood that they may not be entirely objective concerning this matter. The instructional personnel who have devoted time and energy to inservice training may be reluctant to view the effort as futile. On the other hand, there is no evidence that their perception of the training's impact is not accurate. Indeed, the fact that the instructional personnel have such a perception may in itself produce an impact on job performance, since they will likely strive to perform in keeping with the perception.

The perception of the impact of TEC inservice training on job performance was bolstered by the perception that the quality of the training is high. The interview of the TEC Council members revealed a general agreement on the high quality of TEC inservice training. One Council member commented:

> I've had the opportunity to travel and visit other [centers] ... all over the country. And if there is a better setup than the Dade TEC, I've yet to see it. We by far are delivering a better service than any other.

The survey of instructional personnel revealed that they again concur with the Council members. The instructional personnel were asked to separately assess the quality of TEC ancillary programs and services, and TEC inservice courses. Regarding the latter, they were asked to rate a series of 11 statements about their most recent inservice course from the TEC. The ratings were provided using a four-point scale ranging from agree (4) to disagree (1). The results of the ratings appear in Table 10. The 11 statements address various aspects of the course, including the objectives (aspects #2 and #8), the content, and the activities (aspect #3). Some aspects, like the instructor's abilities (aspect #7) and the impact of the course (aspect #11), have been previously discussed in this report. An examination of Table 10 reveals that comparably high ratings were provided by the teachers and the teacher aides and teacher assistants. The mean ratings provided by the teachers range from 3.5 to 3.8; and the mean ratings provided by the teacher aides and teacher assistants range slightly higher from 3.5 to 3.9. Clearly both groups of instructional personnel have a high regard for all aspects of their most recent inservice course from the TEC.

In reference to the TEC ancillary programs/services, the instructional personnel, who had availed themselves of them, were asked to rate them. Using a four-point scale ranging from excellent (4) to poor (1), the instructional personnel were asked to rate the management of the programs/services. In so doing, they were asked to consider such things as the helpfulness of the staff, the promptness of the service, and the appropriateness of the forms. The instructional personnel were also asked to rate the benefit of the programs/services to them personally. The results of these ratings appear in Table 11. An examination of this table reveals that the mean ratings of the management of the various ancillary programs/services ranges from 3.0 to 3.5; and the mean ratings of the benefit ranges from 3.1 to 3.5. As with the inservice courses, the instructional personnel appear to have a high regard for the TEC ancillary programs/services.

Table 10

Mean Ratings of Various Aspects of TEC Courses

	Aspects of Courses	Teachers		Teacher Aides/Assistants	
		n	Rating	n	Rating
1.	Information on the course (e.g., time, location, etc.) was readily available at my school.	758	3.7	22	3.6
2.	The instructor presented specific objectives at the beginning of the course.	772	3.7	23	3.8
3.	The content and activities of the course were relevant to the stated objectives.	771	3.7	22	3.8
4.	The instructor's assessment of my performance in the course was accurate.	674	3.7	20	3.9
5.	The time frame of the course (i.e., the number and length of sessions) facilitated learning.	767	3.5	22	3.5
6.	The classroom setting of the course was appropriate and comfortable.	772	3.5	22	3.7
7.	The instructor of the course was both knowledgeable and effective.	773	3.7	22	3.8
8.	In general, the course accomplished the stated objectives.	769	3.6	22	3.8
9.	I was given an opportunity to evaluate the course at its conclusion.	734	3.8	20	3.7
10.	In general, I found the course to be a worthwhile experience.	773	3.6	22	3.9
11.	I have put into practice some of the knowledge/skills acquired in the course.	743	3.5	21	3.8

Note: The ratings are based on the following scale: 4 = Agree, 3 = Slightly Agree, 2 = Slightly Disagree, 1 = Disagree, 0 = Not Applicable. The mean ratings are truncated at the first decimal place.

Finally, the instructional personnel were asked to "grade" the overall performance of the TEC. The results, which appear in Table 12, are consistent with the ratings of the inservice courses and the ancillary programs/services. The TEC received a grade of "A" from 43.6% of the respondents, and a grade of "B" or higher from 87.2% of the respondents. Considering that these grades are provided by the recipients of the center's services, they attest to the center's success in meeting the inservice needs of the district's instructional personnel.

Table 11

Mean Ratings of the Management and Benefit of TEC Ancillary Programs and Services

Programs/Services	Ratings			
	n	Management	n	Benefit
Educational Travel Program	60	3.4	59	3.4
Mini-Grant Program	32	3.0	30	3.2
Conference/Seminar Credit Program	281	3.4	279	3.4
TEC Registration Unit	119	3.5	116	3.5
Review for the Florida Teacher Certification Examination	76	3.3	72	3.5
Add-on Certification Program	217	3.4	217	3.4
Teacher Aides and Assistants Internal Certification Program	20	3.5	20	3.5
Prescriptive Inservice	90	3.3	88	3.1
Professional Library	109	3.5	109	3.5

Note: The ratings are based on the following scale: 4 = Excellent, 3 = Good, 2 = Fair, 1 = Poor. The mean ratings are truncated at the first decimal place.

Table 12

Distribution of the "Grades" on the Overall Performance of the TEC

Grades	Teachers		Teacher Aides/Assistants	
	n	%	n	%
A, Excellent	343	43.2	13	54.1
B, Good	349	44.0	8	33.3
C, Average	80	10.0	3	12.5
D, Below Average	18	2.2	0	0
F, Failure	3	0.3	0	0

Note: The percentages are truncated at the first decimal place.

CONCLUSIONS

The Dade-Monroe Teacher Education Center (TEC) was founded in 1979 to serve the instructional personnel in the public schools of Dade and Monroe counties. Teachers, teacher aides and teacher assistants can take inservice courses from the TEC for either personal growth or professional development. In addition, the TEC offers a number of ancillary programs and services like the Educational Travel Program and the Professional Library. The evaluation of the TEC basically examined the efficacy of the center in providing these services to the instructional personnel in the district. The specific focus of the evaluation was presented in the Design of the Evaluation as a series of questions, which can now be addressed:

1. How are the number and types of inservice courses offered by the TEC determined?

   In selecting the number and types of inservice courses it will offer, the TEC must respond to such things as requests from individual schools, recommendations from TEC reps, requests from district offices, and directives from the state. However, in terms of total volume, the primary determinant in the selection of courses offered by the TEC is the Inservice Program Survey. This is a survey of all instructional personnel, which is conducted each spring.

   Some TEC facilitators, however, expressed reservations regarding the use of this method of determining inservice offerings. Their reservations stem from such things as the survey's consistently low return rate, and the method's lack of a proactive orientation. Nevertheless, despite such perceived shortcomings, the evaluation found that the district's instructional personnel are generally satisfied with the inservice courses offered by the TEC.

2. How many instructional personnel take and complete inservice courses?

   Based on the survey of instructional personnel conducted for the evaluation, it can be concluded that 65.3% of the district's instructional personnel have taken one or more inservice courses from the TEC. Furthermore, of the 34.7% of instructional personnel who have never taken an inservice course from the TEC approximately two-fifths have not ruled out the possibility of taking one in the future. The survey also produced data that supported several other conclusions concerning the instructional personnel who have taken TEC inservice courses. For example, these individuals took their most recent inservice course relatively recently. At the time of the survey in May of 1987, 56.1% of them were either taking the course or had taken it within the year. In terms of motivation, these individuals were overwhelmingly motivated by professional considerations. Professional growth was reported by 91.1% of them

as the reason for taking their most recent course. Finally, 46.7% indicated they had applied TEC inservice courses toward certification.

Despite the considerable degree of participation, the evaluation found evidence that the TEC inservice courses do not uniformly meet the needs of all types of instructional personnel. Participation in inservice courses is disproportionately lower for secondary instructional personnel than for elementary instructional personnel. The data suggests that this situation may be due to the difficulty in meeting the more specialized needs of instructional personnel at the secondary level. While this may be cause for concern, it should be acknowledged that this situation seems to be common across other teacher education centers in the state.

3. How are TEC instructors selected and evaluated?

The selection of TEC instructors is accomplished through a collaborative effort between the TEC and the universities affiliated with the center. In making the selection, consideration is given to a number of factors including the instructor's credentials, experience, availability, recommendations and evaluations. The evaluations are particularly important. They are provided by the participants in the course. The participants rate the course on a ten-item questionnaire, which addresses such issues as: (a) the attainment of course objectives, (b) the relevance of the materials, and (c) the quality of the course content. At the completion of the course, the TEC staff collects and reviews all the evaluations.

4. What effect do the evaluations by inservice participants have on the TEC operation?

After the TEC staff has collected and reviewed the participants' evaluations of an inservice course, the results are forwarded to the instructor. Copies of the results are also kept on file at the TEC for use in monitoring the performance of the instructor. If over a period of time the instructor exhibits a pattern of low evaluations, the situation is investigated. If it is determined that the instructor is indeed deficient, the TEC then takes steps to avoid employing the individual in the future. In contrast, an instructor who exhibits a pattern of high evaluations will be employed repeatedly by the TEC. In this manner the participants' evaluations are used to systematically screen the pool of instructors. This process appears to be successful, since the survey of instructional personnel revealed that they are clearly satisfied with the TEC instructors.

5. What effect has the increase in the minimum number of hours per course had on inservice offerings and participation?

The state's 1985 directive requiring a minimum of 10 hours of instruction for an approved inservice course was anticipated by the

TEC. Thus, when the directive was issued, the center was already in the process of eliminating courses which did not comply. The evaluation of the TEC consequently found no current or residual impact of the directive on either the inservice course offerings or the degree of participation.

6. What is the ratio of the TEC budget, including university allocated funds, to the number of: (a) staff, (b) hours of service, and (c) inservice courses offered? How do these compare to other centers in the state?

The last complete fiscal year at the time comparative data was collected for the evaluation was 1985-86. In that year the TEC had a budget of $1,139,154.00. It consisted of $729,834.00 allocated for operating expenses and $409,320.00 allocated for university services (i.e., hiring instructors from affiliated universities). With this budget the center underwrote such major items as the salaries of a full-time staff of 18, the ancillary programs/services, and the inservice training activities. Regarding the latter, there were 711 separate inservice training activities underwritten, which generated 246,370 service hours for the participants. The evaluation of the TEC intended to compare the ratios of these figures to comparable teacher education centers in the state. This effort, however, was for the most part unproductive. Centers that appeared comparable in terms of the population served and the size of the district proved to be quite distinct in terms of the operational issues examined. Consequently, a meaningful comparison of budget ratios was not possible. Yet the data did provide some indications that the TEC may be comparably underfunded, and this does bring to mind the comments made by a number of TEC Council members and TEC facilitators regarding the budget constraints of the center. Such evidence, however, was not deemed sufficient to render a complete picture of the center's fiscal status. For one thing, it does not consider the possibility that the budget priorities of the TEC Council and the director may have contributed to the perceived budget constraints. This may or may not be the case; it is mentioned only to illustrate the complexity of accurately gauging the adequacy of the TEC budget. To do so would require a fiscal analysis which was beyond the scope of the evaluation.

7. What other programs are operated by the TEC? What proportions of staff time and budget dollars are devoted to these programs? How do these proportions compare to other centers in the state?

The TEC operates a variety of ancillary programs and services including:

°Educational Travel Program
°Mini-Grant Program
°Conference/Seminar Credit Program
°TEC Registration Unit
°Review for the Florida Teacher Certification Examination

*Add-on Certification Program
*Teacher Aides and Assistants Internal Certification Program
*Prescriptive Inservice
*Professional Library

It was not possible to determine what proportion of budget dollars is devoted to such programs/services, since a number of them have no budget per se. The demand on TEC dollars made by ancillary programs/services is for the most part restricted to the facilitators' services. Viewed from this perspective, the TEC facilitators devote approximately 20.0% of their time on the job to ancillary programs/services. While this appears to be a substantial amount of time, the TEC Council members generally felt it was time well spent. Furthermore, the survey of instructional personnel revealed considerable participation in these programs/services; 54.7% of the instructional personnel in the district have utilized one or more ancillary programs/services. Indeed, the only program/service which appears to be underutilized is the Professional Library. This is ironic, since the library is the ancillary program/service which makes perhaps the greatest demand on TEC resources. Finally, the effort to compare the proportion of time devoted by the TEC to ancillary programs/services with other teacher education centers in the state proved futile. As discussed in response to question #6, the operational uniqueness of each center in the sample precluded a meaningful comparison.

8. What is the job of a TEC facilitator? Do the duties of the job require a teacher-on-special-assignment?

The TEC facilitators are a select group of teachers-on-special-assignment (TSAs) who work long hours in a demanding job. The specific duties of the job are both diverse and numerous. An examination of these duties revealed that on a typical day the facilitators perform tasks that range from clerical to administrative. This diversity, coupled with the fact that facilitators are generally only observed outside of the center when they open or close out an inservice course, may have led to speculation about the nature of the job. The evaluation, however, found the job of facilitator to be a crucial element in the operation of the TEC. The data collected generally supports sustaining the job in its present form. This particularly applies to retaining TSAs in the position. A background in teaching is generally regarded as essential to successfully performing the job. Indeed only one aspect of the job may warrant adjustment. The evaluation found that on the average the facilitators devote approximately 20.0% of their time on the job to clerical tasks. This is clearly an inefficient use of a TSA's time.

9. How are the budget priorities of the TEC established? What procedure is used to determine which activities are funded?

State statute 231.606 specifies that "the duties and responsibilities" of the TEC Council include making "recommendations on an

appropriate budget." The evaluation of the TEC found that, in keeping with the intent of the law, the Council members generally felt that they had some input in establishing budget priorities. Determining the funding of specific activities, however, is the responsibility of the director of the TEC. Nevertheless, it has been the practice of the director to also seek input from the Council regarding the funding of specific activities. This has resulted in notable cooperation between the Council and the director in establishing budget priorities.

Yet despite this cooperation, there is considerable discontent among Council members stemming from adjustments that have been made to the budget subsequent to their review. Since the Council under the law functions only in an advisory capacity, there is nothing improper in such adjustments to the budget. Nevertheless, budget adjustments which are made without consulting the Council serve only to foster discontent among the members; and this discontent can potentially to undermine the operation of the Council.

10. How convenient is the current procedure for requesting that the TEC offer a particular inservice course?

The procedure for requesting that the TEC offer a particular inservice course simply involves submitting the appropriate form to the center. To provide sufficient lead time, the TEC staff requests that this form be submitted at least 30 days prior to the first session of the course. The evaluation of the TEC found that individuals who have made such requests generally found the procedure to be very convenient. Most had experienced no problems in adhering to it. Nevertheless, the procedure is essentially the same for all requests. And, there were indications that the procedure is unnecessarily cumbersome when the request involves a recurring course. Since the request for a recurring course makes less of a demand on the TEC than a non-recurring course, the procedure in this situation could be streamlined.

11. What is the quality of the TEC inservice training? What is the impact of inservice training taken for professional development?

The evaluation of the TEC examined the perceived quality of the center's inservice activities. It revealed that the district's instructional personnel perceived the quality of both ancillary programs/services and inservices courses to be high. Furthermore, they generally felt that they put into practice the knowledge and skills acquired in TEC inservice courses. Given these perceptions, it is not surprising that the instructional personnel generally held the entire TEC operation in high regard. Indeed, when they were asked to "grade" the overall performance of the TEC, 87.2% gave the center a grade of "B" or higher. Considering that these grades are provided by the recipients of the center's services, they attest to the success of the TEC in meeting the inservice needs of the district's instructional personnel.

In summary, the evaluation of the TEC identified some issues that warrant attention. These issues include, for example, the disproportionately lower participation rate of secondary instructional personnel, the proportion of time facilitators devote to clerical tasks, and the unnecessary cumbersomeness of the procedure for requesting a recurring course. These, however, are minor issues when compared to the extent of the TEC operation. Moreover, one of the benefits of a program evaluation is the identification of just such issues, so they can be addressed and the program ultimately improved. This is not to imply that much improvement is needed in the TEC operation. The TEC practices and procedures examined by the evaluation were found to be generally effective. The job of facilitator was found to be crucial to the operation. The rates of participation in both inservice courses and ancillary programs/services were impressive. And overall the performance of the TEC was rated very high by the recipients of its services. Consequently, despite the perception of budget constraints, the TEC has been very effective in meeting the inservice needs of the district's instructional personnel.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The preceding report is a draft, currently being reviewed by TEC staff. As part of the review process, recommendations will be jointly developed by Office of Educational Accountability and TEC staff. Since the review process is still underway, these recommendations are not currently available.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Bergquist, C. C., Ellzey, M. A., & King, D. S. (1983). An Evaluation of Teacher Education Centers. Tallahassee, FL.: Evaluation Systems Design, Inc.

Guskey, T. R. (1986). Staff development and the process of teacher change. Educational Researcher, 15, 5-12.

Hall, G. E., & Loucks, S. (1978). Teacher concerns as a basis for facilitating and personalizing staff development. Teachers College Record, 80, 37-53.

Jones, L. L., & Hayes, A. E. (1980). How valid are surveys of teacher needs? Educational Leadership, 37, 390-392.

Joyce, B., & Showers, B. (1980). Improving inservice training: The messages of research. Educational Leadership, 37, 379-385.

Sparks, G. M. (1983). Synthesis of research on staff development for effective teaching. Educational Leadership, 41, 65-72.

Zigarmi, P., Betz, L., & Jensen, D. (1977). Teachers' preferences in and perceptions of in-service education. Educational Leadership, 34, 545-551.

APPENDIX A

Interview of TEC Facilitator

Dade County Public Schools

Name: _____

Date: _____

Interview of TEC Facilitator

Note: Questions about inservice courses refer only to courses under the complete control of the TEC, and not to courses developed by other organizational units which utilize the TEC documentation system.

1(1). Is the survey of instructional personnel the primary means of determining the type and quantity of inservice courses offered by the TEC?

_____

_____

_____

2(1). In your opinion, does the survey accurately reflect the needs and desires of the district's instructional personnel?

_____

_____

_____

3(1). Is the priority of inservice courses offered by the TEC ever based on something other than the results of the survey?

_____

_____

_____

4(1). How could the system for establishing the priority of inservice courses be improved?

_____

_____

_____

5(3). Who selects the TEC instructors? What set of criteria is used?

_____

_____

_____

Interview of TEC Facilitator

6(3). Who evaluates the TEC instructors? What set of criteria is used?

7(4). In making an "employability decision" about a TEC instructor, what weight is given to the evaluations of the instructor by individuals in his/her course?

8(3,4). In your opinion, what is the quality of TEC instructors in general?

9(3,4). How could the quality of TEC instructors be improved?

10(5). Regarding the increase in the minimum number of hours per inservice course, what has been the impact on enrollment? On courses offered?

11(8). Describe the major tasks you performed on the job yesterday. How much time was devoted to each task?

Interview of TEC Facilitator

12(8). Was yesterday a typical day on the job? If not, how was it different?

13(8). How would you describe the duties of a TEC facilitator?

14(7). Aside from tasks connected with providing training for the district's instructional personnel, what other TEC programs do you oversee? What proportion of your job time is devoted to these programs?

15(8). What proportion of your job consists of clerical tasks?

16(8). How does your background in teaching help you to perform the job of a TEC facilitator?

17(8). What additional preparation would benefit you in performing this job?

Interview of TEC Facilitator

18(8). How would you rate the general performance of the TEC facilitators under the present organizational system?

19(8). Could the duties of the TEC facilitators be more efficiently performed under some other organizational system, e.g., a core of administrators with an expanded clerical staff?

20(8). How many hours are you on the job during a typical week? Do you work nights and/or weekends? How frequently?

21(8). What do you hope is your next career move? How can the job of TEC facilitator prepare you?

22(9). How are the budget priorities for the TEC established?

23(9). What procedure is used to determine which activities are funded under a priority item?

Auth: MIS; Exp. Date: Feb. 28, 1987

24(9). To improve the efficacy of the TEC, how would you alter the budget priorities? The activities funded? The system for establishing both?

25(10). What is the procedure for making a formal request that the TEC offer a particular inservice course?

26(10). Have there been problems honoring such requests? To what do you attribute these problems?

27(10). During any given month, how many such requests are received by the TEC? What proportion are honored?

28(10). What set of criteria is used to determine which requests are honored?

29(10). Does the procedure for making and honoring such requests need to be improved? How?

Interview of TEC Facilitator

30. Additional Comments:

APPENDIX B

Interview of TEC Council Member

Dade County Public Schools

Name:_____

Date:_____

Interview of TEC Council Member

Note: Questions about inservice courses refer only to courses under the complete control of the TEC, and not to courses developed by other organizational units which utilize the TEC documentation system.

1(4). In your opinion, how responsive in general is the TEC to the needs and desires of the instructional personnel it serves?

_____

_____

_____

2(4). In making an "employability decision" about a TEC instructor, what weight is given to the evaluations of the instructor by individuals in his/her class?

_____

_____

_____

3(3,4). In your opinion, what is the quality of TEC instructors in general?

_____

_____

_____

4(3,4). How could the quality of TEC instructors be improved?

_____

_____

_____

5(5). Regarding the increase in the minimum number of hours per inservice course, what has been the impact on enrollment? On courses offered?

_____

_____

_____

Auth: MIS; Exp. Date: Feb. 28, 1987

6(5). What other outcomes have resulted from this increase in minimum hours?

7(7). In reference to the programs operated by the TEC that do not provide direct training to instructional personnel (e.g., Professional Library, Mini Grant Program), do you feel that the impact of these programs justifies the resources allocated to them?

8(7). Given your response to the previous question, what adjustment (if any) in the allocation of TEC resources do you feel is warranted?

9(8). How would you describe the duties of a TEC facilitator?

10(8). How does a background in teaching help a TEC facilitator to perform his/her job?

11(8). What additional preparation would benefit a TEC facilitator in performing his/her job?

Interview of TEC Council Member

12(8). How would you rate the general performance of the TEC facilitators under the present organizational system?

13(8). Could the duties of the TEC facilitators be more efficiently performed under some other organizational system, e.g., a core of administrators with an expanded clerical staff?

14(9). How are the budget priorities for the TEC established?

15(9). What procedure is used to determine which activities are funded under a priority item?

16(9). How much imput do you, as a TEC Council member, have in establishing budget priorities and determining which activities are funded?

17(9). To improve the efficacy of the TEC, how would you alter the budget priorities? The activities funded? The system for establishing both?

Auth: MRS; Exp. Date: Feb. 28, 1987

Interview of TEC Council Member

18(11). In your opinion, what is the quality of TEC inservice training in general?

19(11). Does the quality of TEC inservice training need to be improved? How?

20(11). In your opinion, what is the general impact on job performance of TEC inservice training taken for professional development?

21(11). Do you feel that the impact on job performance justifies the resources allocated for such training?

22. Additional Comments:

Auth: MIS; Exp. Date: Feb. 28, 1987

APPENDIX C

Interview: Procedure for Requesting TEC Service

Dade County Public Schools

Name: _____

Date: _____

Interview: Procedure for Requesting TEC Service

1(10). What is the procedure for making a formal request that the TEC offer a particular inservice course?

_____

_____

_____

2(10). How many such requests have you made during the last six months? During the last year?

_____

_____

_____

3(10). Regarding your most recent request, approximately how many days prior to the date that the inservice occurred was the request submitted to the TEC?

_____

_____

_____

4(10). In your opinion, how convenient is the current TEC procedure for making a request for an inservice course?

_____

_____

_____

5(10). Have you experienced any problems in adhering to this procedure? To what do you attribute these problems?

_____

_____

_____

Auth.: MIS; Exp. Date: May 31, 1987

Interview: Procedure for Requesting TEC Service

6(10). Does the procedure for requesting an inservice course need to be improved? ____ Yes ____ No

If "Yes", how?

_____

_____

_____

7(11). In your opinion, what is the quality of TEC inservice training in general?

_____

_____

_____

8(11). Does the quality of TEC inservice training need to be improved?

____ Yes ____ No

If "Yes", how?

_____

_____

_____

9. Additional comments:

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

Auth. MIS; Exp. Date: May 31, 1987

APPENDIX D

Teacher Education Center Evaluation
Instructional Personnel Survey

CODE: _____
1 2 3 4

TEACHER EDUCATION CENTER EVALUATION
INSTRUCTIONAL PERSONNEL SURVEY
1986-87

DADE COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOLS

OFFICE OF EDUCATIONAL ACCOUNTABILITY

Dade County Public Schools

Do not write in this are

TEACHER EDUCATION CENTER EVALUATION
INSTRUCTIONAL PERSONNEL SURVEY

1986-1987

INSTRUCTIONS:

- This is a survey of your perception of the Teacher Education Center (TEC).
- The survey is coded to facilitate follow-up inquiries. Your identity, however, will be kept confidential.
- If you have had little or no contact with the TEC, please respond to items #1 to #5 only.
- Read and follow all instructions carefully.

1. Check your current position.

____ (1) teacher ____ (2) teacher aide ____ (3) teacher assistant

____ (4) other: _____

2. Check the school level of your current position.

____ (1) elementary ____ (2) junior high/middle ____ (3) senior high

____ (4) community/adult ____ (5) other: _____

3. How many total years have you been actively employed by the Dade County Public Schools?

____ (1) less than 1 year ____ (2) 1 to 3 years ____ (3) 4 to 7 years

____ (4) 8 to 12 years ____ (5) 13 to 18 years ____ (6) 19 to 25 years

____ (7) 26 years or more

4a. Have you ever taken an inservice course offered by the TEC? (2)

____ (1) Yes ____ (2) No

b. If you responded "no," which of the statements listed below and on the next page best describes your reason for not taking TEC inservice courses?

____ (1) I am not familiar with the TEC.

____ (2) I do not know what inservice courses are offered by the TEC.

Auth. MIS. Exp. Date: May 31, 1987

Dade County Public Schools

Do not write in this are

TEACHER EDUCATION CENTER EVALUATION
INSTRUCTIONAL PERSONNEL SURVEY

1986-1987

_____ 3 My professional/career needs are not met by the inservice courses offered by the TEC.

_____ 4 My personal needs (e.g., convenience, accessibility) are not met by the inservice courses offered by the TEC.

_____ 5 To date, I have had no reason to take an inservice course offered by the TEC.

_____ 6 Other: _____

5a. Have you ever utilized any of the TEC programs/services listed in item #21 of this survey? _____ 1 Yes _____ 2 No (7) 10

b. If you responded "no," which of the following statements best describes your reason for not utilizing the TEC programs/services listed? 11

_____ 1 I am not familiar with the TEC.

_____ 2 I do not know what specific programs/services are available through the TEC.

_____ 3 My professional/career needs are not met by the programs/services available through the TEC.

_____ 4 My personal needs (e.g., convenience, accessibility) are not met by the programs/services available through the TEC.

_____ 5 To date, I have had no reason to utilize the programs/services available through the TEC.

_____ 6 Other: _____

INSTRUCTIONS:

- If you responded "no" to both items #4 and #5, STOP. The remaining items are not applicable to you. Return the survey in the enclosed return envelope.
- If you responded "no" to item #4 and "yes" to item #5, go to item #21. Items # 6 to #20 are not applicable to you.
- If you responded "yes" to item #4 and either "yes" or "no" to item #5, proceed to item #6.

Auth. MIS, Exp. Date: May 31, 1987

Dade County Public Schools

Do not write in this area.

TEACHER EDUCATION CENTER EVALUATION
INSTRUCTIONAL PERSONNEL SURVEY

1986-1987

6. Have you ever renewed or added a teaching area to your certificate through inservice courses offered by the TEC? (2) 12

___ Yes (1) ___ No (2) ___ Not applicable, I am a teacher aide/assistant. (3)

7. When did you take your most recent inservice course from the TEC? (2) 13

___ I am currently taking it. (1)

___ I took it less than a year ago. (2)

___ I took it less than three years ago. (3)

___ I took it more than three years ago. (4)

8a. When was the majority of class time scheduled for your most recent in-service course from the TEC? (2) 14

___ During my off hours (1) ___ During my duty hours (2)

b. When do you prefer to take an inservice course? 15

___ During my off hours (1) ___ During my duty hours (2)

9a. What was the primary reason for taking your most recent inservice course from the TEC? (2) 16

___ Personal growth (1) ___ Professional growth (2)

b. If you responded "professional growth," which of the following statements best describes the circumstances? 17

___ The course was part of a planned inservice activity which was made available to me. (1)

___ It was necessary to take the course to meet certification requirements. (2)

___ I was required to take the course to correct a teaching deficiency. (3)

___ I decided on my own to take the course for professional reasons. (4)

___ Other: _____ (5)

Dade County Public Schools

Do not write in this area.

TEACHER EDUCATION CENTER EVALUATION
INSTRUCTIONAL PERSONNEL SURVEY

1986-1987

INSTRUCTIONS:

- Use the following scale to respond to items #10 to #20 regarding your most recent inservice course from the TEC.
- Write the appropriate number from the scale in the space provided to the left of each item.

Agree	Slightly Agree	Slightly Disagree	Disagree	Not Applicable
4	3	2	1	0

_____	10. Information on the course (e.g., time, location, etc.) was readily available at my school.	(1)	18
_____	11. The instructor presented specific objectives at the beginning of the course.	(11)	19
_____	12. The content and activities of the course were relevant to the stated objectives.	(11)	20
_____	13. The instructor's assessment of my performance in the course was accurate.	(3,11)	21
_____	14. The time frame of the course (i.e., the number and length of sessions) facilitated learning.	(1,11)	22
_____	15. The classroom setting of the course was appropriate and comfortable.	(1,11)	23
_____	16. The instructor of the course was both knowledgeable and effective.	(3,11)	24
_____	17. In general, the course accomplished the stated objectives.	(11)	25
_____	18. I was given an opportunity to evaluate the course at its conclusion.	(4)	26
_____	19. In general, I found the course to be a worthwhile experience.	(11)	27
_____	20. I have put into practice some of the knowledge/skills acquired in the course.	(11)	28

Auth: MIS; Exp. Date: May 31, 1987

Dade County Public Schools

Do not write in this are

TEACHER EDUCATION CENTER EVALUATION
INSTRUCTIONAL PERSONNEL SURVEY

1986-1987

INSTRUCTIONS:

- If you responded "no" to item #5, go to item #24. Items #21 to #23 are not applicable to you.
- If you responded "yes" to item #5, proceed to item #21.

21. Check the TEC programs/services on the following list which you have utilized. (7) 29-

____ 1 Educational Travel Program

____ 2 Mini-Grant Program

____ 3 Conference/Seminars Program

____ 4 TEC Registration Unit

____ 5 Review for the Florida Teacher Certification Examination

____ 6 Add-on Certification Program

____ 7 Teacher Aides and Assistants Internal Certification Program

____ 8 Prescriptive Inservice

____ 9 Professional Library

Auth MIS Exp Date: May 31, 1987

Dade County Public Schools

Do not write in this area

TEACHER EDUCATION CENTER EVALUATION
INSTRUCTIONAL PERSONNEL SURVEY

1986-1987

INSTRUCTIONS:

- Items #22 and #23 deal only with the TEC programs/services you checked in item #21.
- Use the following scale to respond to items #22 and #23.
- Write the appropriate number from the scale next to the number of the utilized service.

Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor
4	3	2	1

22. For the TEC programs/services you checked in item #21, rate the management of the programs/services based on your experience. Consider such things as the helpfulness of staff, promptness of service, appropriateness of forms, etc. (7) 39-

1 _____ 2 _____ 3 _____ 4 _____ 5 _____

6 _____ 7 _____ 8 _____ 9 _____

23. For the TEC programs/services you checked in item #21, rate the benefit of the programs/services to you personally. (7) 46-

1 _____ 2 _____ 3 _____ 4 _____ 5 _____

6 _____ 7 _____ 8 _____ 9 _____

24. How would you "grade" the overall performance of the TEC in providing inservice training and related programs/services to the instructional personnel of this district? (11)

_____ A Excellent
5

_____ B Good
4

_____ C Average
3

_____ D Below Average
2

_____ F Failure
1

Auth. MIS Exec. Date May 31, 1987

Dade County Public Schools

TEACHER EDUCATION CENTER EVALUATION
INSTRUCTIONAL PERSONNEL SURVEY

1986-1987

25. If you wish to offer a comment or clarification on any aspect of this survey, please do so.

_____

_____

_____

_____

INSTRUCTIONS:

Thank you for your cooperation. Please return the completed survey to:

Mail Code: 9999, Room 506
Dr. Joseph Gomez
Office of Educational Accountability

Use the enclosed return envelope.

Auth: MIS; Exp. Date: May 31, 1987

APPENDIX E

Survey of Teacher Education Center (TEC) Directors

Dade County Public Schools District: _____

Do no
write
in th
area.

Survey of Teacher Education Center (TEC) Directors

1. Check all the job groups for whom your TEC routinely offered inservice courses during the 1985-86 school year. (2)

   _____ administrators _____ teachers _____ teacher aides/assistants

2. Indicate the number of incumbents in your district in each of the following job groups during the 1985-86 school year. (6)

   teachers: _____

   teacher aides/assistants: _____

3. Provide the designated information for the clerical staff at your TEC during the 1985-86 school year. (6)

Job Title	Number of Incumbents	General Duties
_____	____	_____
_____	____	_____
_____	____	_____
_____	____	_____
_____	____	_____

4. Provide the designated information for the professional staff at your TEC during the 1985-86 school year. Be sure to include your job. (6,8

Job Title	Number of Incumbents	General Duties
_____	____	_____
_____	____	_____
_____	____	_____
_____	____	_____
_____	____	_____

Do not write in this area.

Survey of Teacher Education Center (TEC) Directors

5a. How many inservice activities, including activities that did not generate Master Plan Points (MPP), were conducted by your TEC during the 1985-86 school year? (6)

Number of MPP Activities		Number of Non-MPP Activities		Total Number of Activities
_____	+	_____	=	_____

b. How many participants were enrolled in these activities? (6)

Number of Participants in MPP Activities		Number of Participants in Non-MPP Activities		Total Number of Participants
_____	+	_____	=	_____

c. How many service hours were awarded through these activities? (Note: service hours X participants). (6)

Service Hours of MPP Activities		Service Hours of Non-MPP Activities		Total Number of Service Hours
_____	+	_____	=	_____

6a. Indicate the amount of funds by category that comprised the total budget of your TEC during the 1985-86 school year. (6)

State Funds Based on FTE		Funds Allocated For University Hours		District Funds		Total Budget for 1985-86
$_____	+	$_____	+	$_____	=	$_____

b. How much of the $6 per FTE unit allocated by the state for staff development did your TEC receive during the 1985-86 school year? $_____ (6)

Do not write in this area.

Survey of Teacher Education Center (TEC) Directors

7a. Aside from providing inservice courses, were there other programs/services that your TEC operated during the 1985-86 school year? _____ Yes _____ No (7)

b. If you responded "yes" to #7a, identify the programs/services. (7)

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

c. If you responded "yes" to #7a, approximately what percentage of your staff's time was devoted to the operation of these programs/services? _____ % (7)

8. Would you like to receive a copy of the final report on the evaluation of the Dade-Monroe Teacher Education Center? _____ Yes _____ No

Thank you for your cooperation. Please return the completed survey to:

Dr. Joseph J. Gomez
Dade County Public Schools
1450 N.E. Second Avenue, Room 506
Miami, Florida 33132

Use the enclosed return envelope.

The School Board of Dade County, Florida adheres to a policy of nondiscrimination in educational programs/activities and employment and strives affirmatively to provide equal opportunity for all as required by:

Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964– prohibits discrimination on the basis of race, color, religion, or national origin.

Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, as amended - prohibits discrimination in employment on the basis of race, color, religion, sex, or national origin.

Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972 - prohibits discrimination on the basis of sex.

Age Discrimination Act of 1967, as amended - prohibits discrimination on the basis of age between 40 and 70.

Section 504 of the Rehbilitation Act of 1973 - prohibits discrimination against the handicapped.

Florida Educational Equity Act - prohibits discrimination on the basis of race, sex, national origin, marital status or handicap against a student or employee.

Veterans are provided re-employment rights in accordance with P.L. 93–508 (Federal) and Section 295.07, Florida Statutes, which also stipulates categorical preferences for employment.